8/12/71

Dear Orestes,

Getting the clippings you mailed on the tenth this morning made me wonder if for the second time I had started to write you, laid that aside and then buried it under work on my desk. This did happen, and again I am sorry. I am pushing hard to get part of a book done because there are many other things I also must do and the nature of the material is complicated.

The names of the members of the grand jury are unknown to me.

It is proper for the U.S.Attorney to protect or try to protect his witnesses. However, merely asking reporters not to identify them is hardly the way to do this and makes one wonder what his real purposes were. Perhaps propaganda. If he wanted, really wanted, his witnesses not to be identified, and if he were really worried about gangsters (he knows Garrison isn't going to shoot them) ht would be taking their testimony under such conditions nobody would know about it. And, if the experienced reporters recognized none of them, they are probably minor figures, like maybe men who has slots in their businesses.There is something about this story that does not ring quite true.

There is special interest in the story "DA's Appeal May Be Heard By U.S.Court", if it is from a recent paper. Here he is appealing the decision against him in the Shaw case, yet he has recently dropped the case against Walter Sheridan on the ground there would be no case against Shw. Perhaps this is an older clipping?

Your comment on Gallinghouse's speech before the press club is correct. He is the head of the office that was making frame-up deals allover the state, keeping people who committed the worst crimes out of jail in order to get them to swear falsely, and Sheridan was working with them, offering big money.

When these kind of people talk about enforcing the law and living within the law, itx is like a whore talking about love.

Many thanks,

Sincerely,